



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/714,823	11/17/2003	Claire Svetlana Vishik	1033-T00468	2178
60533 7590 01/22/2008 TOLER LAW GROUP 8500 BLUFFSTONE COVE SUITE A201 AUSTIN, TX 78759				
EXAMINER BAIRD, EDWARD J				
ART UNIT 3693		PAPER NUMBER		
MAIL DATE 01/22/2008		DELIVERY MODE PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary**Application No.**

10/714,823

Applicant(s)

VISHIK, CLAIRE SVETLANA

Examiner

EDWARD BAIRD

Art Unit

3693

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 November 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/ISD)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date 20 September 2004.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant has amended claims 1-33 in this application. No new claims have been added. Thus claims 1-33 remain pending and are presented for examination.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments and amendments filed on 09 November 2007, with respect to rejections of claims 1-33 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a), have been fully considered but are moot in view of new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 4-9, 11, 12, 15-20, 22, 23, 26-31, and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over **Gonen-Friedmann et al** (US Pub No. 2001/0047332) in view of **Caballero et al** (USPub. No. 2007/0203771).
5. Regarding **claim 1**, **Gonen-Friedmann** teaches a method comprising:
 - providing a line-by-line user interface to enable a user to question individual line items in a transaction,

Gonen-Friedmann discloses "A computer-implemented and Internet-based method of managing Accounts Receivable (AR) information includes steps of receiving a customer request

for remote Internet access to AR information (such as pending invoices) owned by vendor" [Abstract]. **Gonen-Friedmann** further discloses "The present invention is also a computer-implemented and Internet-based method of **disputing** an invoice from a vendor to a customer, comprising the steps of accessing a database record corresponding to the invoice to be disputed over a Web site of the vendor;" [paragraph 0014]. **Gonen-Friedmann** further discloses "if a customer 302, 304, 306 wishes to **dispute an invoice** and/or an account (step S1), he or she may be prompted to select one of a plurality of predefined reason codes, as shown in step S2a. The plurality of predefined reason codes may include codes for disputing freight charges, as shown at S2a1, disputing taxes applied as shown at S2a2, disputing a specific invoice line, as shown at S2a3 or disputing a duplicate invoice, as shown at S2a4, for example" [paragraph 0037]. Examiner interprets **disputing a specific invoice line** as the Applicant's **questioning individual line items in a transaction**.

Gonen-Friedmann discloses "Other common customer requests and questions include requests for an account balance, inquiries related to payments being applied to invoices, requests for amounts past due, inquiries asking whether all credits have been applied to the proper account, for example" [paragraph 0005]. Examiner further interprets **inquiries related to payments being applied to invoices, requests for amounts past due, etc.** as inclusive of Applicant's **enable a user to question individual line items in a transaction**.

Gonen-Friedmann further discloses "selecting a reason code for the dispute and at least a disputed amount; validating a Credit Memo Request incorporating the selected reason code and the disputed amount to create a pending Credit Memo Request, and causing the Credit Memo Request to be processed through a workflow engine to send and route the Credit Memo Request through at least one of a selected process for the selected reason code"

[paragraph 0018]. Examiner interprets selecting a reason code for the dispute as Applicant's **enable a user to question individual line items in a transaction.**

Gonen-Friedmann does not explicitly disclose:

- wherein the user interface provides multiple user-selectable links to multiple destinations for multiple question types per line item to facilitate routing a user request to an appropriate destination based on its question type

However, **Caballero** discloses a complex order processing system that allows customer service representatives and **customers** to access the customer's accounts, service profiles, quotes, and orders [Abstract]. Examiner interprets customers to access the customer's accounts, service profiles, quotes, and orders as Applicant's **user-selectable links to multiple destinations.**

Caballero further discloses "complex order processing in accordance with the present invention **integrates with other front-end applications** that allow companies set up the structure required for order management by defining products, pricing structures, and catalogs of products. ... these applications include the ability to decompose orders into multiple work orders and **route them** to the appropriate system for provisioning service" [0013]. Examiner interprets **integrates with other front-end applications** as inclusive of Applicant's **links to multiple destinations for multiple question types**. Examiner interprets **routing multiple work orders** as inclusive of Applicant's **linking to multiple destinations to facilitate routing to an appropriate destination.**

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of **Gonen-Friedmann's** disclosure to allow **customers** to access the their own (i.e. customer's) accounts, service profiles, quotes, and orders as disclosed by **Caballero** so that

users can capture and validate customer orders for complex combinations of products and services [Caballero 0004].

6. Regarding **claim 4, Gonen-Friedmann** teaches:

- for a line item, the multiple user-selectable links comprise a first link to question the line item and a second link to dispute the line item

Gonen-Friedmann discloses a system comprising a database configured to store the invoice and a computer adapted to connect to the Internet to allow a customer using the computer to remotely access the invoice and to dispute the invoice. The invoice can be disputed by selecting a reason code for the dispute, and at least a disputed amount; validating a Credit Memo Request incorporating the selected reason code and the disputed amount to create a pending Credit Memo Request [0018]. Examiner interprets remotely accessing the invoice as Applicant's **first link to question the line item** and selecting a reason code for the dispute as Applicant's **second link to dispute the line item**.

Examiner notes that this claim is not substantially different from claim 1 wherein multiple links used for questioning and disputing items as specified in claim 4 is also inherent in claim 1.

7. Regarding **claim 5, Gonen-Friedmann** teaches

- for a line item, the multiple user-selectable links comprise first link to question the line item and a second link to correct the line item.

Gonen-Friedmann discloses the use of multiple links to correct information (second link to correct line item). **Gonen-Friedmann** discloses: "The validating step may include a step of submitting the Credit Memo Request if the Credit Memo Request is correct and may include the step of correcting the Credit Memo Request if any information appearing thereon is incorrect", [paragraph 0015]. Examiner interprets *submitting* the Credit Memo Request as Applicant's **first**

Art Unit: 3693

link to question the line item. Examiner interprets *correcting* the Credit Memo Request as Applicant's **second link to correct the line item.**

8. Regarding **claim 6 and 7**, **Gonen-Friedmann** teaches:

- for a line item, the multiple user-selectable links comprise a first link to question an amount of a product (claim 6) *wherein the amount comprises an amount of time (claim 7)*, or a service associated with the line item and a second link to question a billing rate associated with the line item (claim 6).

Gonen-Friedmann discloses: "The reasons for disputing a bill are many, and include such reasons as returned items, no credit given for a returned item, invalid amounts, invalid taxes, freight, duplicate invoice, incorrect freight charges, and the like", [paragraph 0036]. Examiner interprets invalid amounts as Applicant's **amount of a product** (claim 6); incorrect freight charges, and the like as Applicant's **billing rate associated with the line item** (claim 6); and "the like" to be including of Applicant's **amount of time** (claim 7). Examiner notes that customers may dispute about time issues as it may involve freight charges (express delivery vs. standard) as well as negotiating payments schedules.

9. Regarding **claim 8**, **Gonen-Friedmann** teaches:

- the multiple user-selectable links comprise a plurality of electronic mail addresses.

Gonen-Friedmann discloses using electronic mail addresses as the multiple of links.

Gonen-Friedmann discloses: "Such a selected . . . personnel may include, for example, the collector assigned to that account and/or the sales person listed on the disputed invoice. Such a notification may include an email to the collector and/or to other selected persons within vendor's organization and/or an entry in an internally accessible Web notification page", [paragraph 0041]. Examiner interprets email as that which requires electronic mail addresses in this claim.

Art Unit: 3693

10. Regarding **claim 9, Gonen-Friedmann** teaches:

- for a line item, providing an online form to receive user-entered text to direct to a user-selected one of the multiple user-selectable links.

Gonen-Friedmann teaches an online form to receive user-entered text to direct to a user-selected link. **Gonen-Friedmann** discloses: "Upon being properly authenticated, the customer 120 may be sent to an "Account Details" Web page. The Account Details Web page 200, shown at FIG. 2, allows the customer to view, in a tabular format, all of his or her outstanding invoices, account balances, etc. The information displayed in the Accounts Details page is particular to the logged-on customer only", [paragraph 0028 and Figure 2]. Examiner interprets a logged-on customer being online. Figure 2 is a representation of an online display page which accepts user-entered text. Figure 2 also shows sample user-selected links such as transactions, status, date, purchase order, sales order, original amount and remaining amount.

11. Regarding **claim 11, Gonen-Friedmann** teaches:

- the user interface is integrated with a workflow or business process management tool to enable a maintainer to edit, amend and extend a process of routing user requests.

Gonen-Friedmann teaches a method with a user interface which is integrated with a workflow to enable a maintainer to edit, amend and extend a process of routing user requests. **Gonen-Friedmann** discloses a workflow engine which: "may further be configured to send a notification upon approval or rejection of the pending Credit Memo Request, the disputed amount being automatically credited to the disputed invoice when the pending Credit Memo Request is approved. The Web site may also allow the customer to add explanatory comments to a blank field, to enable the **selected hierarchy of persons** empowered to approve the validated Credit Memo Request and the primary approver for the selected reason code to process the Credit Memo Request when the selected reason code does not fit a reason for

Art Unit: 3693

requesting the Credit Memo Request. The Web site may also enable the submission of the Credit Memo Request if the Credit Memo Request is correct and the correction of the Credit Memo Request if any information therein is incorrect. The reason codes, process, hierarchy and primary approver may be predefined by the vendor. The Web site may further be configured to authenticate a customer before allowing the customer to access the invoice", [paragraph 0019]. Examiner interprets the selected hierarchy of persons to be the Applicant's **maintainer** who may edit, amend and extend a process of routing user requests.

12. **Claims 12, 15-20, and 22** describe systems which are parallel to the methods described in claims 1, 4-9, and 11, respectively. In turn, claims 12, 15-20, and 22 are rejected for the same reasons as claims 1, 4-9, and 11, respectively.

13. **Claims 23, 26-31, and 33** describe articles (i.e. computer-readable mediums), which are parallel to the methods described claims 1, 4-9, and 11, respectively. In turn, claims 23, 26-31, and 33 are rejected for the same reasons as claims 1, 4-9, and 11, respectively.

14. Claims 2, 3, 13, 14, 24, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over **Gonen-Friedmann et al** (US Pub No. 2001/0047332) in view of **Caballero et al** (USPub. No. 2007/0203771) as applied to claims 1, 12, and 23 above, in further view of **Zimmer et al** (US Pub No. 2003/ 0051226).

15. Regarding **claim 2**, **Gonen-Friedmann** and **Caballero** teach all of the limitations of claim 1, the claim upon which this depends. **Gonen-Friedmann** and **Caballero** do not teach:

- processing an extensible Markup Language (XML) representation, of each of the individual line items to create the line-by-line user interface, wherein the XML representation includes tags within which the multiple user-selectable lids per line item are defined.

However, **Zimmer** teaches a system and method of translating an abstract notation of an application to a series of sub-applications which uses XML tags for referencing data in different reports. **Zimmer** discloses: "The example XML above represents Report entities are defined in the **XML** descriptions 38. Multiple reports that use similar layout and presentation properties can reference an external **XML** file to handle these similarities The <center> tag is used to center align data. Lines 08 through 10 highlight our ability to use Intelligent Variables (IVars) in our reports. IVars can be used by queries to retrieve data from the database 20a, b for the purpose of generating reports" [paragraph 0074].

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of **Gonen-Friedmann's** disclosure to use **Zimmer's** XML tags so that a user can share data between different databases.

16. Regarding claim 3, **Gonen-Friedmann** and **Caballero** teach all of the limitations of claim 2, the claim upon which this depends. **Gonen-Friedmann** and **Caballero** do not teach:

- the XML representation corresponding to a particular line item identifies a corresponding database from which data associated with the particular line item can be verified.

Zimmer teaches use of XML representation to identify a source database as described in rejection of claim 2. Therefore, claim 3 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 2.

17. **Claims 13 and 14** describe systems which are parallel to the methods described in claims 2 and 3, respectively. In turn, claims 13 and 14 are rejected for the same reasons as claims 2 and 3, respectively.

18. **Claims 24 and 25** describe articles (i.e. computer-readable mediums), which are parallel to the methods described claims 2 and 3, respectively. In turn, claims 25 and 25 are rejected for the same reasons as claims 2 and 3, respectively.

Claims 10, 21, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over **Gonen-Friedmann et al** (US Pub No. 2001/0047332) in view of **Caballero et al** (USPub. No. 2007/0203771) as applied to claims 1, 12, and 23 above, in further view of in view of **Nielsen** (US Patent No. US 5,948,054).

19. Regarding **claim 10**, **Gonen-Friedmann** teaches:

- the multiple user-selectable links comprise a first link that facilitates communication with a human to address a first question type, and a second link that facilitates machine-to-machine communication to address a second question type without requiring human intervention.

Gonen-Friedmann teaches a link that facilitates machine-to-machine communication to address one question type without requiring human intervention as discussed in the rejection of claim 9 above. **Gonen-Friedmann** does not disclose a link that facilitates communication with a human to address another question type.

However, **Nielsen** teaches a method and system for facilitating the exchange of information between human users in a computer network. **Nielsen** discloses: "In a networked computer system including a customer computer associated with a human customer, one or more consultant computers associated with one or more human consultants, and a server computer, the human customer sends an information request to the server via the customer computer. The request, which includes a question that the customer wishes to have answered, does not specify a consultant from which the answer may be obtained. In response, the server determines which one or ones of the consultants is qualified to provide the requested information. The server then solicits the requested information from one or more of the qualified consultants. If at least one of the qualified consultants decides to provide the requested information, then the server receives the information from the consultant via one of the

consultant computers. Thereafter, the server sends the information to the customer via the customer computer. In this manner, the server matches the human customer with the question with a human consultant with the answer" [Abstract]. Examiner interprets server soliciting information from qualified consultants as Applicant's **first link that facilitates communication with a human**.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of **Gonen-Friedmann's** disclosure to use a link as disclosed by **Nielsen** that facilitates communication with a human to address another question type so that questions and inquiries that may require more explanation or details may be discussed with a consultant that has more extensive knowledge of a company's business processes.

20. **Claims 21 and 32** describe a system and an article (i.e. computer-readable medium) respectively, which are parallel to the method described in claim 10. In turn, claims 21 and 32 are rejected for the same reasons as claim 10.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

Art Unit: 3693

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ed Baird whose telephone number is (571) 270-3330. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 7:30 am - 5:00 pm Eastern Time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jay Kramer can be reached on (571) 272-6783. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Ed Baird
Assistant Patent Examiner
571-270-3330

/James A. Kramer/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3693